

Personally, I am disgusted by the fact that this case has even gotten this far. How lax are our morals when misleading and evasive rhetoric - especially from parties who will clearly profit from a new arrangement - is seen as a legitimate argument in favor of allowing said parties to more or less impose their will on the way average Americans access the internet? China does not have net neutrality. Russia does not have net neutrality. If we lose ours, we take a step away from being a nation where all voices matter equally, and a step towards becoming a nation where the richest few control yet another aspect of public life. If you give even the slightest hint of a damn about the wellbeing of American people, the viability of countless entrepreneurs' eCommerce ventures, or the fairness of something that was invented to be the freest source of information, then you will not relax your regulations on net neutrality. Otherwise, we're going to need to change the last part of the national anthem to read "and the land of the free... to do whatever we want as long as we can outspend the competition."

Protect net neutrality. Don't make it so complicated for normal citizens to lodge a complaint about policies that will directly impact our daily lives. But **do** go fuck yourselves if you capitulate to the anti-neutrality circlejerk. You had such a strong spine when you were standing up for censorship in art and music. I hope you can preserve that commitment to the public interest in this case as well.